



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

the canon, the necessary product of the Christian church as a whole, and not of any individual, receives confirmation in the same way (p. 240).

With these discussions the contribution of the book to the general topic of Christian certainty is substantially exhausted. Without a fundamental departure from Frank, the effort has been made to bring certain difficult questions to a better solution than he was able to give. We do not think that Ihmels has been as successful in this particular as our own countryman, the late Professor L. F. Stearns, of Bangor Theological Seminary. In his *Evidence of Christian Experience* he has given a new and truly rational form to the argument for the Scriptures from the "witness of the Holy Spirit," in which he has been followed by the present writer's *Christian Life and Theology*. These scholars have sought to retain the definiteness of the starting-point adopted by Frank, and they have dispelled the "miracle" of God's approach to the soul by a more scriptural and philosophic explanation of its *modus*. The argument for the Scriptures themselves has been simplified and developed far beyond what Ihmels presents, though in substantial agreement with him.

Of the second book little needs to be said. It is very readable, and shows by its style the benefit of having to write regularly for the express purpose of being understood. It is also marked by strong common-sense and comprehensiveness. But these two excellences last mentioned defeat its purpose to be a "*new foundation*" for Christian certainty. Really there is nothing new in the book whatever. It does not even keep what may be fairly said to have been securely gained in theological circles. It divides certainty into three sorts, historical, rational, and ethico-religious. The latter is the kind of certainty chiefly considered, though both of the others have their place. The most important part of the work is where the "subject" of the certainty is discussed and the individual is exhibited in his relations to the "entire" subject, the whole Christian community. But of specifically Christian certainty the book knows nothing.

FRANK HUGH FOSTER.

OBERLIN, O.

THE LIFE OF DÖLLINGER.¹

PROFESSOR FRIEDRICH'S "Life of Döllinger" will long rank as one of the monumental biographies of the Christian church. It is

¹ *Ignaz von Döllinger*. Sein Leben auf Grund seines schriftlichen Nachlasses dargestellt. Von J. FRIEDRICH. Drei Teile. München: Beck, 1898-1901. Pp. x + 506; iv + 538; v + 732. M. 32; bound, M. 38.

loaded with historical information; it deals with a very great and influential man; and that man played the foremost part in one of the crises of church history. In the forces that impelled him and the forces that flooded and broke against him, we see the great tendencies of history massed and condensed to dramatic vividness and swiftness.

The book is not well made from a literary point of view. The chapters are long and often contain heterogeneous material. It is hard to find again any minor point that has slipped away in the pile. There are few pauses and summaries that would help the reader to look back and understand the territory through which he has traveled. Many portions, especially in the second volume, dealing with the internal affairs of Bavaria, of the university at Munich, and of Catholic administration, are too long for nine out of ten readers of the book. On the other hand, the last volume, especially the activity of Döllinger in connection with the Vatican Council and his literary work in the last two decades of his life, are dispatched too summarily. It looks as if the author had felt that he must finish up somehow for fear of a fourth volume. Thus the book is ill-proportioned. But it is honest work. There is no padding, no rhetoric, no forcing of conclusions. The author states what he knows in a plain, straightforward way, and if the reader has patience and ability enough to digest the material for himself, it is immensely instructive. Even the letters of insignificant and forgotten priests, the immature newspaper articles of Döllinger's idealistic youth, the cliques and speeches of the Bavarian diet, give one a realizing sense of the feelings and prejudices and habits of mind in the Catholic church in the earlier part of the century, and help us to understand to what extent the Vaticanum was an innovation and to what extent a necessary outcome of the past.

The book is meagerest on the personal side. When Döllinger died at the age of almost ninety-one, all who had known his youth were dead. He had no wife or child to treasure his personal recollections. That is one aspect of the loneliness of celibacy. Luise von Kobell has preserved some of his reminiscent talk in her *Erinnerungen*, and on the rather thin material of this book Friedrich had to draw largely. There is a good deal of information about his looks and habits scattered through the book, but nowhere is it grouped and accessible. The author was Döllinger's friend and collaborator; he stood with him in his excommunication, and gave him the sacraments at his death. But, from a fine instinct of modesty and self-repression, his personal relations are kept almost out of sight. And

his interest as a scholar and public man was concentrated on the work of Döllinger. There was no woman to reveal the personality and none to teach Professor Friedrich to see it. I should have given much to know what system Döllinger had for amassing written information. He had immense collections that grew in some cases through thirty or forty years, and that enabled him to write such a book as the *Janus*, with its overwhelming mass of information, within a few months. But I have found nothing in the book to instruct me on that point.

Döllinger got his intellect from his father. His grandfather had been a prominent physician; his father was the most eminent mind of the faculty of Würzburg, a great teacher, a master of clear language, a very modern man, a pioneer in embryology and the use of the microscope, who inspired men with a zest for personal research. When a student asked him for advice about purchasing a library, he advised him to get a microscope first, and a library if he had anything left. From him Döllinger inherited the lucidity of mind and speech, the scientific sanity and submission to facts, the wide range of his intellectual interests, and his love of knowledge for its own sake. The father never wrote for literary fame; he only wanted to know and to impart knowledge. The son's avidity for knowledge was so absorbing that in later years it was his greatest hindrance to literary production. The antiseptic influence of Döllinger's early contact with natural science and with this fine, live scientist cannot be rated too highly.

His piety he got from his mother. She used to pray in the church by the hour, and her favorite son was her companion. The dim religious light bathed his little soul. He found his father, who was so ready to answer all other questions, curiously ignorant on the religious questions that troubled him. When his father told him no one knew, he refused to believe it, and determined to become a priest and find out and then tell his father. It was the desire for knowledge that turned his mind toward the priesthood. For most students the study of theology is the way to the priesthood; for Döllinger the priesthood was the way to the study of theology. His ideal was a little country parish near the woods, with income enough to accumulate a library and with leisure to study. He was always first of all the scholar, the embodied intellect. Repeatedly the opportunity to become bishop or archbishop presented itself in later life, but he did not feel called *pompam facere*, but to mine for knowledge.

It is interesting to note that the Catholicism which laid hold of his youth was not from purely Roman sources, but was the idealized

Catholicism of the Protestant converts, Schlegel, Stolberg, and Winckelmann. He was early impressed by the *semper et ubique et ab omnibus* of Vincentius of Lerinum, and that ideal of the unity, antiquity, and universality of the Christian faith was his inward shield against Protestantism on the one side and the innovations of the Infallibilists on the other. The history of dogma was then a new science. Münscher's book, published in 1799, represented the history of dogma as a history of human intrigues, of vagaries and fluctuations. Catholic theologians felt that it undermined the conviction of unbroken tradition, which was the glory of the Catholic church. The desire to defend his church against that charge of mutability turned Döllinger decisively toward historical and patristic studies. He wanted to know the early centuries in order that he might prove that every dogma had been essentially held by the Fathers of the undivided church and had since been preserved intact. It is the profoundly tragic element in his life that his championship of this ideal of his church brought him into irreconcilable conflict with the actual forces and aims of his church. His church apostatized from him and its ideals.

During the tercentenary of the Reformation in 1817 Catholics maliciously republished one of Luther's last tracts, *Das Papsttum vom Teufel gestiftet*. Döllinger, then eighteen years of age, read it. It was his first acquaintance with Luther, and the violence of the book provoked him to corresponding antagonism. That impression was decisive for half of his life. During all his earlier years he was the militant Catholic, the representative of *catholicisme zélé*, anxious to help in giving the death-blow to Protestantism which he believed to be disintegrating and dying. That made him partisan in his public activities and even in his historical work. Aside from the natural partiality of every man for his own church, and beyond the timid reluctance of Catholic theologians to criticise their church, his polemical attitude toward Protestantism made him write as an attorney rather than a historian, especially in regard to the papacy.

From his university teachers Döllinger seems to have gained little. There were no Catholic church historians of any account, and he had to feel his own way. It was ten years before he knew what might with profit be studied. As a scholar and historian he was a self-made man.

In 1822 he became chaplain at Markt Scheinfeld. In the following year he was called to the seminary at Aschaffenburg as professor of church history and canon law. He was also compelled to teach dogmatics. He taught three courses and fifteen hours a week during

his first year. Yet he was able during his first three years to write a book on *Die Eucharistie in den ersten drei Jahrhunderten*, which won deserved recognition. When he was called to Munich, in 1826, as professor extraordinarius, he lectured nineteen hours a week and yet wrote the last volume of Hortig's church history in one year. He had an amazing capacity for hard work, due in part to his abstemious habits. Even in old age he rose at five and did a day's work before others were up. He breakfasted on a glass of water and supped on a glass of milk. He tasted beer only once in his life, took his wine at meals with three parts water, took long walks daily, and a vacation annually, in which he reveled in poetry. He was a lover of books always. As a boy he made a catalogue of the library of an old Scotch monastery at Würzburg, for no pay except the privilege to live among the English books. When he traveled in later years, he would immediately burrow into the great libraries, and, during the hours when they were closed, he would get his recreation by haunting the bookshops. He kept the dealers and his friends busy hunting for books that they had never heard of. A dealer in Milan watched him piling up a mass of books that he intended to buy, and at last asked him who in the world he might be. When he learned that he was a German from Munich, he said that he did not sell so many books among his people in a year.

Döllinger's scholastic work during the best years of his life was broken into by his public activity. At Munich he was a member of a circle of zealous Catholics who gathered about the great Görres; Baader, Ringseis, and Moy were members of it. With them he contributed to a periodical, *Esos*, and showed great journalistic ability; but this work consumed his energy and interest, and the polemical attitude of mind was not entirely wholesome for the historian. Among others he fell foul of Heinrich Heine, but Döllinger's sarcasm was no match for that past-master of vituperation. Heine wrote a poem on Döllinger which is very funny and very vitriolic (Vol. I, pp. 207-16). In 1845 he was sent to the lower house of the Bavarian diet, against his will. In the revolutionary year, 1848, he spent a year at Frankfurt as a member of the German parliament. Later he was a member for life of the upper house of the diet. He was chief librarian of the university, curator of all the royal scientific collections, and finally president of the Royal Academy. In his parliamentary career he showed rare gifts of extemporary speech. He was always entirely clear, in full control of all his information, incisive, often bitter, a Spanish blade to be feared. Von Sybel says that as a conversationalist

he ranked with Macaulay and Alexander von Humboldt, but unlike them he was also an excellent listener. Among the great men whom he had known Sybel had found equal pleasure only with Bismarck.

But this outside activity did not divert him from his teaching. In 1830 the university had 600 theological students, and Döllinger had 656 enrolled hearers. When he was forty-six, he was the senior of the faculty, most of the other professors were his pupils, and "where Döllinger was, there was the faculty." His fame was international and shed luster on his university and his city. His influence was steadily and powerfully exerted to raise the scientific standard in his church and country. In the eighteenth century it had dropped very low under the educational control of the Jesuits, and the general inclination in Catholic institutions seems to be to look for orthodoxy first and ability next. Döllinger was weary of the safe mediocrities and wanted men of first-class ability. And in the interest of science he was generous and catholic in his choice of them. He secured von Sybel and tried to get Thiersch; he succeeded in winning Möhler for Munich, though he had to give up church history to him and take dogmatics himself. He persistently opposed the tendency, favored by the hierarchy, of withdrawing the education of the Catholic clergy from the universities and shutting up the young priests in seminaries, safe from the dangerous influence of fresh air. There were from five hundred to eight hundred professors in the seminaries of Italy and France and Döllinger asserted that aside from text-books they produced nothing of scientific value.

Döllinger was early interested in the Tractarian movement and hoped great things from it. In 1836 he made his first visit to England, and from that time he was always partial to England and its history. He met many of the most eminent men. Gladstone was a frequent visitor and correspondent. A beautiful letter from Pusey is quoted (Vol. II, pp. 214 ff.); at one visit he left Pusey in tears. Manning was hostile to him. For many years he had a colony of young Englishmen boarding with him in order to be under his direction in their studies. Repeatedly he had invitations to take a professorship, or at least a lectureship, in some Catholic institution in England. It is interesting to imagine what course the Tractarian movement might have taken if the intellectual poverty of English Catholicism had been reinforced by the learning and ability of Döllinger.

Till 1854 Döllinger had the full confidence of the bishops. He was regarded in his own church as a hyperorthodox Catholic and by Protestants as an Ultramontane. His chief aim was still opposition to

Protestantism, especially the unveiling of what he regarded as the Protestant distortion of history. That dictated his partisan sketch of Luther and his collection of adverse testimony in the three volumes of his *Reformation*. Yet he repudiated the name of Ultramontane for himself, both in the earlier sense of one who insisted on ceremonial and churchly devoutness, and in the later sense of one who would foist an alien, Italian type of religion on the German national soul. What were his ecclesiastical ideals? He wanted the church to be freed from the hampering interference of the state everywhere. He was ready to grant equal religious liberty to Protestants and full emancipation to the Jews. He opposed the bureaucratic government of the church, which had made the bishops mere clerks and employees of the Curia. He always insisted that diocesan synods, which had fallen into complete disuse, were positively commanded by the church and would serve to bring the bishops into close and fatherly contact with their priests. In the great democratic and national uprising of 1848 he called aloud for the organization of a national German church, with diocesan and provincial synods and a national council, guided by the German archbishops and represented at Rome by a common representative. At a meeting of the German bishops at Würzburg in 1848 he was the intellectual leader, sweeping the meeting along to an espousal of his ideals and an indorsement of the whole plan. But Rome promptly brought her hand down on the whole thing, jealous for Roman supremacy and Italian control against any uprising of the national spirit, and of the high resolutions at Würzburg nothing at all was realized, not even diocesan synods.

One of the most instructive elements in the book is the frequent and unstudied evidence given of the repression of intellectual liberty and the timidity prevailing in the Catholic church. For instance, Hortig refused to complete his church history and left it to Döllinger, because insinuations of heresy frightened him. Döllinger's continuation of it was attacked because he had stated that in the Ninety-five Theses Luther was right. Only after repeated attempts could a single meeting of Catholic German theologians be convened for scientific discussion, and the slight amount of liberty there exercised stirred Rome so that most stringent conditions were laid down for any repetition of the meeting. Though the "Index" was not in full operation for Germany, the fear of it was always hanging over men. When Döllinger visited Rome for the first and last time, in 1857, the philosophers Günther and Frohschammer had just been put on the "Index." He

learned from the secretary of the Congregation of the "Index" that he and most others were ignorant of German, but if anyone in Germany denounced a book and sent in a translation of questionable passages, it was placed on the "Index" on the strength of that information. When Döllinger reminded him that passages torn from their connection might convey an incorrect impression, he only replied, "Sono le nostre regole," and the appeal to the hallowed routine of the Congregation settled the question. And after that fashion men in Italy decided what might be taught in Germany. It is the natural consequence of this repression of liberty that thought seeks underground channels. It is not an altogether pleasant feature in Döllinger's life that so much of his literary work was done under the cover of anonymity.

After 1854 the period of undisturbed influence and growing power ceased for Döllinger. He had long felt that the current was to be against him; he felt that Gallicanism was declining even in France and papalism was coming. He had even wished for his own sake that he might adopt the coming system and had overhauled his historical knowledge from that point of view. The influence of the Jesuits was increasing. In 1854 the dogma of the immaculate conception was declared; in 1864 Pius IX. published the "Syllabus," which attempts to reverse the course of four centuries; in 1868 the call for the Vatican Council was issued, and Cardinal Antonelli unwisely published a program of what the Council was expected to do, showing that the dogma of infallibility was to be proclaimed "by acclamation." And while his church was thus veering farther and farther away from the ideals for which in her name he had contended all his life, he had himself gone deeper and deeper into the history of that papal system which was rising to its culmination. In 1853 he published his *Hippolytus und Kallistus*, proving by masterly historical criticism that the *Philosophoumena* were by the celebrated Hippolytus, and that the dark picture of the popes Zephyrinus and Kallistus, and of the condition of the Roman churches, was by a Roman presbyter eminent enough to have claimed the papacy. In 1867 he wrote on the Council of Trent; he had come to the conclusion that it was merely a *conciliabulum*, a petty and unfree council of Italian bishops. He was collecting material on the history of the Jesuits, and the farther he went into it, the darker became his view of their influence. The *Civiltà Cattolica* spoke of the Inquisition as "a sublime spectacle of social perfection;" Pius lauded it in an allocution and canonized Arbues, the Spanish inquisitor. Döllinger wrote

a series of articles on "Rome and the Inquisition," anonymously. He wrote an article against the "Syllabus" so severe that not even a liberal daily was willing to publish it, and Reusch found the unpublished manuscript among Döllinger's papers. But perhaps the profoundest impression was made on Döllinger when he realized the extent and importance of historical forgeries in the upbuilding of the papal system. He had formerly taught that the Pseudo-Isidorian Decretals had merely codified and given legal sanction to rights and privileges already in full force and operation at the time of the forgery, so that the course of history would have gone on practically in the same way without them. He now realized that they had effected a revolutionary innovation and had been deeply influential in molding subsequent events. Further, in following up the claims of papal infallibility through history, he found that Thomas Aquinas had been the first to make them. When he investigated what had led Thomas to depart from the position of the earlier scholastics, he found that he had used a catena containing forged quotations from Greek councils and Fathers. This Pseudo-Cyrillus had been written by a Dominican, played into the hands of Pope Urban IV., and by him furnished to Aquinas, and on that basis of forgeries the great scholastic had introduced into Catholic theology the two assertions that the pope is the infallible teacher of the world and the absolute ruler of the church. This discovery was quite overwhelming for Döllinger and for other Catholic scholars to whom he communicated it. The *Janus* was practically complete in his mind in 1863. When his publisher asked him to republish and complete his church history, he replied that he would not be able to leave a line of it intact.

Thus the church was driving in one direction and simultaneously his studies were pushing Döllinger in the opposite direction. Another important antagonism was created by the opposition of Italian to German theology. Döllinger represented the historical school; at Rome the neo-scholasticism of the Jesuits had control. The Germanizing of theology was considered its supreme danger. The Italians were subtle in ethics and canon law, but were untouched by modern historical methods, and so the German mind was uncanny to them, an incommensurable quantity. Yet the Italian theologians were sure that the deposit of faith was especially with them and that the Italian people were to the new covenant what Israel was to the old. From 1850 to 1870 the neo-scholasticism of the church became aggressive in Germany; it was expressed in the "Syllabus;" the pupils of the Jesuits

and of the Collegium Germanicum at Rome were pushed into teaching positions in Germany, and both philosophy and history, "the two eyes of science," were threatened with extinction. Döllinger, on the other hand, had a high and proud consciousness of the great achievements of German thought, of its immense superiority to that semi-mediæval system that was thrusting it aside, and of its mission for the world. In his opening address at the congress of Catholic theologians, to which reference has been made, and in his inaugural address as rector magnificus of the university, he delivered splendid panegyrics on the German universities and people. There was thus a conflict between the new science and the old, embodied in the German and Italian people, and sharpened by the national differences. Döllinger incarnated the one principle; one might say that Pius IX. expressed the other. The thirteenth paragraph of the "Syllabus of Errors" condemns an assertion of Döllinger: "The method and principles by which the scholastic teachers cultivated theology are not at all adapted to the needs of our age and the progress of the sciences."

The events of the Vatican Council and Döllinger's opposition through the *Janus* and the *Letters from Rome* are well known. He opposed the dogma of papal infallibility because it was a revolutionary innovation, unknown to the Fathers for twelve centuries, and begotten in forgeries. Döllinger held that the church could not create new dogmas, but merely declare and define what had always been held. If conditions demanded it, the church assembled in council could ascertain by free inquiry what had always and everywhere been held by the church as the revealed and deposited Christian faith, and then formulate that as a dogma. That faith was constant, and in uttering it the church was infallible. But to assert that God always made one Italian infallible was not a completion of the old position of the church, but a reversal of it, just as revolutionary as a change from a democracy to absolutism.

Döllinger's career as a university teacher practically ended with his excommunication. He now had leisure for literary work. But his passion for knowledge, his unwillingness to call a thing finished while there was any dark region unexplored or any possible source unconsulted, led him on from question to question, and he would probably have merely increased his notes endlessly and fruitlessly, if he had not been compelled to production by two circumstances. The king appointed him president of the Royal Academy, and Döllinger introduced the practice of opening the semi-annual sessions by a historical address,

which was always a model of ripe and broad historical knowledge and showed him growing to the very end. The other circumstance was the collaboration of Reusch. When Reusch finished his history of the "Index" in 1885, he offered Döllinger his help in getting out his unfinished material. Reusch was a rapid and efficient worker, and he pushed Döllinger as he had never been pushed before. From 1887 to 1890 they published the *Autobiography of Bellarmine*, the *Geschichte der Moralstreitigkeiten*, and the *Geschichte der gnostisch-manichäischen Sekten*.

During the larger part of his life Döllinger was a zealous Catholic, a defender of ideal Catholicism, and a vigorous opponent of Protestantism. Then he saw evil forces gaining control of his church. At the same time the facts of history unsealed his eyes. By living in history he repeated in his personal life the experiences that carried Europe from the Middle Ages to the nineteenth century. His attitude toward the papacy and toward Protestantism changed. But his ideal of the church remained the same. When he no longer saw the union of Christendom realized in the Roman Catholic church, he sought it in more spiritual ways, as his addresses on "The Reunion of the Christian Churches" testify.

WALTER RAUSCHENBUSCH.

ROCHESTER THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY,
Rochester, N. Y.

THE RELIGION OF THE ROMANS.

THE appearance of Wissowa's long-expected book¹ marks a distinct epoch in the study of Roman religion. The increasing interest in this field has manifested itself of late years in a number of publications, dealing with different aspects of the subject, *e. g.*, De'Marchi's *Il Culto Privato di Roma Antica*, Fowler's *Roman Festivals*, Samter's *Familienfeste*; but until the completion of this book by Wissowa we have had no treatment of the whole subject sufficiently comprehensive to include the results of that modern research work of which Wissowa himself has been so great a part. With its skilful handling of ancient and modern literature, its command of epigraphical and monumental sources, and its abundance of suggestion, the work stands as one of the most brilliant contributions of contemporary German scholarship; and even if American readers will sometimes shy at the length of the

¹ *Religion und Kultur der Römer*. Von GEORG WISSOWA. München: Beck, 1902. xii+534 pages. M. 8.